UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1990/SR.53
14 March 1990

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Forty-sixth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 7 March 1990, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. QUISUMBING (Philippines)

CONTENTS

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories, including:

(a) Question of human rights in Cyprus

(b) Study of situations which appear to reveal a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights as provided in Commission resolution 8 (XXIII) and Economic and Social Council resolutions 1235 (XLII) and 1503 (XLVIII): report of the Working Group on Situations established by the Commission at its forty-fifth session (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

CONTENTS (continued)

Advisory services in the field of human rights (continued)

Report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities on its forty-first session (continued)

Further promotion and encouragement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the question of the programme and methods of work of the Commission:

(a) Alternative approaches and ways and means within the United Nations system for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

(b) National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights;

(c) Co-ordinating role of the Centre for Human Rights within the United Nations bodies and machinery dealing with the promotion and protection of human rights (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN ANY PART OF THE WORLD, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO COLONIAL AND OTHER DEPENDENT COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES, INCLUDING:

(a) QUESTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN CYPRUS

(b) STUDY OF SITUATIONS WHICH APPEAR TO REVEAL A CONSISTENT PATTERN OF GROSS VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS AS PROVIDED IN COMMISSION RESOLUTION 8 (XXIII) AND ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS 1235 (XLII) AND 1503 (XLVIII): REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON SITUATIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE COMMISSION AT ITS FORTY-FIFTH SESSION (agenda item 12) (continued) (E/CN.4/1990/L.56)

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.56

1. Mr. COSTA LOBO (Portugal), introducing the draft resolution, said that the text, which was a self-explanatory one, reflected the sponsors' view that the Working Group on Situations should be established on a regular basis. Since the decision would rest with the Economic and Social Council, the operative part took the form of a draft resolution recommended for adoption by the Council. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

2. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.56 was adopted without a vote.

3. Mr. MIYASHITA (Japan) said that although his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, it reserved the position it would take up in the Economic and Social Council because of questions relating to the financial and administrative implications, the procedure for the election of members and the need for them to act in their personal capacities.

ADVISORY SERVICES IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS (agenda item 22) (continued) (E/CN.4/1990/L.16/Rev.1, L.68, L.72, L.73, L.90; E/CN.4/Sub.2/1989/58-E/CN.4/1990/2, chapter I A, draft resolution V)

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.16/Rev.1

4. Mr. LEPRETTE (France), introducing the draft resolution, said that it was difficult to present a draft resolution on the subject of Haiti. Although it would be unfair to take no account of that impoverished country's huge problems, world public opinion was painfully aware of recent events there.

5. At its previous session, the Commission had decided to continue providing Haiti with advisory services in view of the progress made and the encouraging prospects. Since the summer of 1989, however, the situation had deteriorated; the recently proclaimed state of siege and the accompanying violence had disappointed those who had been ready to accept the Haitian Government's assurances about a return to democracy. Although the state of siege had subsequently been lifted and an amnesty declared, time would be needed to restore the shaken confidence.

6. The text was presented under agenda item 22 so as to conform to the framework of the relevant discussions. Some parts of it had been revised so as not to appear too severe, in view of Haiti's particular circumstances; but the text provided that, at the Commission's next session, the question of human rights in Haiti should be considered under agenda item 12, although if, as was hoped, the situation in Haiti improved sufficiently, the matter could well be referred back to the item on advisory services. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

7. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

8. Mr. COOK (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, at the Commission's forty-fifth session, his delegation had been concerned that criticism was being levelled at the Government of Haiti for events that had occurred prior to its assumption of office. That Government's recent actions were indefensible, however, and called into question its commitment to improving the observance of human rights in Haiti.

9. Suspension of articles of the constitution, declaration of a state of siege and arrests were not appropriate responses to the unfortunate acts of violence that had preceded them; especially disturbing was the deportation, without due process, of several responsible democratic opposition leaders.

10. His delegation welcomed the Haitian Government's pledge to carry out a democratic transition, but believed that the situation there warranted the action the Commission had just taken.

11. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela), speaking also on behalf of the Argentine, Brazilian, Colombian and Mexican delegations said that they had supported draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.16/Rev.1 because they were gravely concerned about the deteriorating human rights situation in Haiti. However, they wished to record their disquiet about the decision, in operative paragraph 13, that the Commission would, at its next session, consider the report of the independent expert under item 12 of its agenda since that, in their view, implied an *a priori* appraisal of the situation in Haiti.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.68

12. Mr. RHENAN SEGURA (Observer for Costa Rica), introducing the draft resolution, said that the sponsors hoped that the text, whose purpose was to renew the mandate of the Expert on the situation in Equatorial Guinea, could be adopted by consensus.

13. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.68 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.72

14. Mr. FULDA (Federal Republic of Germany), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Gambia, Japan, Madagascar and the Philippines, said that it followed the general lines of the resolution on the subject adopted without a vote at the Commission's previous session. The first and fifth preambular paragraphs reflected the principle that advisory services should be rendered by the Secretary-General solely at the

READEX FICHE

request of Governments; the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs reflected important elements contained in the Secretary-General's current report (E/CN.4/1990/43).

15. The request, in operative paragraph 3, to the Secretary-General to provide resources for the enlargement of advisory services, particularly from section 24 of the regular budget, stemmed from the increasing demand from Governments to have new projects financed under those services. The same consideration underlay the request, in operative paragraph 6, for further Secretariat restructuring.

16. Operative paragraph 9 had been revised in a manner which not all the sponsors were, perhaps, aware of: the expression "national infrastructures" should read "national and regional infrastructures", the spelling of the last word being corrected. Operative paragraph 11 had been slightly revised so as to reflect the fact that the aim of the co-operation among the United Nations bodies was to promote human rights in the development strategies and policies of the United Nations.

17. Operative paragraph 14 was a new text, requesting the Secretary-General to give special attention to the proposals made by the special rapporteurs and representatives.

18. His delegation felt confident that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

19. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.72 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.73

20. Mr. FULDA (Federal Republic of Germany), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Gambia, Japan and Madagascar, said that the first and seventh preambular paragraphs, and operative paragraph 10, expressed the sponsors' understanding of how co-operation between Governments, non-governmental organizations and the Centre for Human Rights should work. Whereas the seventh preambular paragraph stated that requests for advisory services could be put forward only by Governments, operative paragraph 10 encouraged Governments to seek contact and to co-operate with non-governmental human rights organizations in implementing programmes under the Voluntary Fund. The reference in operative paragraph 6 to the particular needs of developing countries from all regions referred mainly to Asian countries, which had hitherto benefited less from programmes implemented with the financial assistance of the Voluntary Fund.

21. Operative paragraphs 11 and 12 reflected the desire of donor and receiving countries alike for the utmost transparency relating to priorities and the procedures to be followed. His delegation felt confident that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

22. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.73 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.90

23. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.90 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution V in chapter I, section A, of the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1989/58-E/CN.4/1990/2)

24. Draft resolution V was adopted without a vote.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission had concluded its consideration of agenda item 22.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES ON ITS FORTY-FIRST SESSION (agenda item 19) (continued) (E/CN.4/1990/L.66, L.70, L.71, L.83, L.85/Rev.1, L.88, L.99, L.104; E/CN.4/Sub.2/1989/58-E/CN.4/1990/2, draft resolutions VI, VIII, X, XI, XII, XIII and XIV in chapter 1, section A, and E/CN.4/1990/2, chapter 1 B, draft decisions 1 and 3)

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.66

26. Mr. LEPRETTE (France), introducing the draft resolution, said that it was a purely procedural resolution. The draft took account of the fact that, owing to lack of time, the Sub-Commission had been unable to consider the report by Mr. Louis Joinet on the practice of administrative detention (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1989/27) pursuant to Commission resolution 1989/38 and had therefore decided that it should be examined as a matter of high priority at its forty-second session.

27. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.66 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.70

28. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document E/CN.4/1990/L.104, containing the financial implications of draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.70.

29. Ms. ANDREYCHUCK (Canada), introducing the draft resolution, said that it was similar in many respects to the text of resolution 1989/34, which the Commission had adopted by consensus at its forty-fifth session. The main differences were contained in operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 10. The text had been drafted so as to incorporate the operative parts of Sub-Commission draft resolutions X and XI and draft decision 3 and replace them.

30. With regard to operative paragraph 5, her delegation sincerely believed that the increase in the duration of the Working Group's session from 5 to 10 days would allow for substantial progress in the work on the draft Declaration on Indigenous Rights. With the concurrence of its co-sponsors, her delegation wished to revise the second line of the paragraph by inserting the words "10 serviced meetings in the" between the words "for" and "ten".

31. She hoped that, as in the past, the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

32. Miss ATTAH (Nigeria) said that her delegation would be pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution. However, it had a reservation to enter with regard to operative paragraph 6, since it believed that the question of

setting a date for the international year of the world's indigenous populations was too important to be left to chance. If a decision were not taken on the question at the current juncture, her delegation would raise the issue again in the relevant organs of the United Nations as well as at the next session of the General Assembly. She hoped that it would be possible to work with other interested delegations with a view to arriving at a consensus date.

33. The plight of indigenous peoples was of great concern to the Commission and a year of solidarity with them would help to focus greater attention on positive actions in their favour. Her delegation would therefore prefer to retain the 1993 date contained in draft resolution XI of the Sub-Commission.

34. Mrs. GALVIS (Colombia) said that her delegation supported the views expressed by the representative of Nigeria and thought that retention of the date of 1993, suggested by the Sub-Commission in its draft resolution XI, would be a good idea.

35. Mrs. BATACLAN (Philippines) said that her delegation, too, associated itself with the views expressed by the representative of Nigeria. It thought, however, that the question of an international year for the world's indigenous populations could be taken up in the General Assembly. It favoured the year 1993, as recommended by the Sub-Commission.

36. Mrs. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico) said that her delegation endorsed the remarks made by the previous speakers. In its view, it would not be contrary to the intent of draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.70 to request that 1993 be proclaimed the international year of the world's indigenous populations.

37. After an exchange of views in which Ms. ANDREYCHUCK (Canada), Mrs. GALVIS (Colombia) and Miss ATTAH (Nigeria) took part, the CHAIRMAN noted that draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.70, would be revised so as to subsume draft resolution XI and draft decision 3 of the Sub-Commission.

38. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.70, as revised, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.71

39. Mr. PETERS (Observer for Netherlands), introducing the draft resolution, said that it was mainly procedural in nature and along the lines of resolution 1989/35, which the Commission had adopted at its previous session without a vote. It did not deal with the Sub-Commission's proposal that a special rapporteur be appointed nor did it relate to the programme of action proposed by the Sub-Commission. It focused on the implementation of the Slavery Conventions and the ways in which such implementation could be improved.

40. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

41. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.71 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.83

42. Mr. STRUYE DE SWIELANDE (Belgium), introducing the draft resolution, said that, at its most recent meeting, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had decided to request two independent experts, Mr. Chernichenko and Mr. Treat, to prepare a report on existing international norms and standards pertaining to the right to a fair trial for submission to the Working Group on Detention and to the Sub-Commission. In order to avoid repetitive debate, the draft resolution simply requested that the report be submitted directly to the Sub-Commission at a plenary meeting.

43. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.83 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.88

44. Mr. STROHAL (Observer for Austria), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, who had been joined by Japan, said that it was modelled on the previous resolutions on the subject adopted by the Commission. It also contained an updated paragraph welcoming the decision of the Sub-Commission to establish a sessional working group to prepare an overview and an analysis of the suggestions and proposals which had been made in order to enable the Sub-Commission to discharge better its responsibilities.

45. After the text had been submitted, the sponsors had received some additional suggestions with regard to, first, the number of draft resolutions forwarded by the Sub-Commission to the Commission for action, and second, the need to inform the Sub-Commission of the debate in the Commission under the agenda item in question. Those suggestions had been favourably received by the sponsors. He therefore intended to add a new operative paragraph 9, to read:

> "Requests the Sub-Commission, at its forty-second session, to consider its practice of forwarding draft resolutions and decisions to the Commission for attention, action or consideration."

the existing paragraphs 9-15 being renumbered accordingly.

46. He also proposed to add an additional paragraph after new paragraph 16 to read:

> "17. Invites the Chairman of the Commission to inform the Sub-Commission on the debate under this item."

existing paragraph 16 being renumbered 18.

47. He hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

48. Mr. ABRAM (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation reluctantly joined in the consensus on the draft resolution because of the importance of the messages conveyed in the eighth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs. He expected the members of the Sub-Commission to be both expert and independent of their Governments, and

believed that the Sub-Commission, as a subsidiary organ of the Commission, should expect guidance from the Commission to enable it to carry out useful and timely work. However, much of the draft resolution was identical to that of the previous year and the status quo was unacceptable to his Government.

49. He did not approve of the Sub-Commission adopting country-specific resolutions, as there was no need for the Sub-Commission to duplicate the Commission's efforts in that regard. It was also unacceptable for the Sub-Commission to forward to the Commission dozens of draft resolutions which were often of a wasteful and highly politicized nature.

50. Another of the Sub-Commission's practices with which he disagreed was the use of highly paid outside consultants, or Secretariat staff members, to do work which should have been carried out by the Sub-Commission's own expert members. He also deplored the Sub-Commission's habit of undertaking projects which had been neither requested nor approved by the Commission.

51. Meaningful reform of the Sub-Commission was long overdue, and the draft resolution did not meet the Commission's obligations in that regard. He hoped that the reform efforts to be undertaken at the next session would be appropriate, and that the concerns which he had expressed, which were not restricted to his own delegation, would be taken into consideration by the recently elected members of the Sub-Commission.

52. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.88, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution VI in chapter I, section A of the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1989/58-E/CN.4/1990/2)

53. Draft resolution VI was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution VIII in chapter I, section A of the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities

54. Mr. RIETJENS (Belgium) said that his delegation, which attached special importance to respect for humanitarian law in times of armed conflict, supported the adoption of a resolution underscoring the importance of that question. He fully endorsed the view that an adequate dissemination of the principles of humanitarian law was one of the most important means of promoting respect for human rights. After consultation with several delegations, including that of Switzerland, he had three minor amendments to propose to the draft resolution recommended by the Sub-Commission. First, he wished to add the following paragraph after the second preambular paragraph:

> "Recognizing the vital role of the International Committee of the Red Cross in the dissemination of international humanitarian law,".

55. The following new paragraph should be added as operative paragraph 1, the existing paragraphs being renumbered accordingly:

"1. Notes that the States Parties to the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 and to the two Additional Protocols of 1977 have undertaken to disseminate those instruments as widely as possible and, in particular, to include the study thereof in their programmes of military instruction and to encourage the study thereof by the civilian population;".

56. The following new paragraph should replace existing paragraph 2:

"3. Recommends that this education also include transmission of knowledge of the relevant instruments in the field of human rights as well as of the Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and the Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, with a view to ensuring respect for the principles and rules contained in these provisions;".

57. Draft resolution VIII, as orally amended, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution XIII in chapter I, section A of the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities

58. Draft resolution XIII was adopted without a vote.

59. Mr. SCHWANDT (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, as his delegation fully supported the general thrust of the draft resolution, it had joined in the consensus despite the fact that it had serious reservations with regard to the third preambular paragraph. The sexual exploitation of children was a world-wide phenomenon; it was not limited to third world countries, and the Governments of those countries were not lacking in their determination to combat such abhorrent practices.

60. Mr. ROMARE (Sweden), said that, although his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, it believed that the sexual exploitation of children was also a problem in the developed countries, a point that it would have liked to see reflected in the third preambular paragraph.

61. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America), said he agreed with the comments made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Draft resolutions XII and XIV in chapter I, section A of the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities

62. Draft resolutions XII and XIV were adopted without a vote.

Draft decision 1 in chapter I, section B of the report of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, and the amendment contained in document E/CN.4/1990/L.99

63. Mr. BARKER (Observer for Australia), introducing the proposed amendment (E/CN.4/1990/L.99), said that it was self-explanatory and built upon the work undertaken by the Committee on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women. He therefore recommended it for adoption.

64. Draft decision 1 as amended by document E/CN.4/1990/L.99, was adopted without a vote.

65. Mr. STEEL (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his comments applied also to draft resolutions VI and XIV, which had just been adopted, and to draft resolution XI. The statement of programme budget implications for those draft resolutions illustrated the shortcomings identified in the report of the Secretary-General (A/44/234).

66. The programme budget implications did not indicate whether the costs identified could be met within the existing programme budget, nor did they take into account contingency fund procedures. His delegation expected all conference servicing costs to be financed under Section 29 B (Conference Services, Geneva). Moreover, Section 23, Human Rights, already provided $1.69 million for recurrent activities of a perennial nature, and he therefore expected that the costs involved in the resolutions to which he had referred would also be covered by the existing allocations.

67. Although he was aware of the problems involved in preparing statements of programme budget implications, he strongly urged the Secretariat to improve the quality of such statements in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the General Assembly.

FURTHER PROMOTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, INCLUDING THE QUESTION OF THE PROGRAMME AND METHODS OF WORK OF THE COMMISSION:

(a) ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS;

(b) NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS;

(c) CO-ORDINATING ROLE OF THE CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND MACHINERY DEALING WITH THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS (agenda item 11) (continued)
(E/CN.4/1990/L.55, L.69, L.78, L.79, L.81, L.86, L.87, L.89 and L.105 and E/CN.4/Sub.2/1989/58-E/CN.4/1990/2, chapter I A, draft resolution I)

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.55

68. Mr. KHITROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by the United Kingdom, said that the need for such a resolution arose from the increase in the number of resolutions and decisions adopted by the human rights bodies of the United Nations. If Governments received the list referred to in the draft resolution within a month and a half at the latest after each session, they would be able to prepare replies and information properly.

69. In addition, in two or three years' time, a comparison of such lists could serve as a basis for deciding which areas and questions required detailed consideration and which issues could be completed. The list would streamline the work of the Secretariat without requiring any additional financial resources. As a temporary measure, the list could be drafted in English only.

70. Mr. ZODIATES (Cyprus) said that his delegation wished to be a sponsor of the draft resolution.

71. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.55 was adopted without a vote.

72. Mr. MIYASHITA (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, while his delegation had not wished to oppose the consensus, it saw no point in asking the Secretary-General to prepare such a list. If the draft resolution had been put to the vote, it would have voted against it.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.69

73. Mr. VILLARROEL (Philippines), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Thailand, drew attention to the new elements contained in paragraphs 1, 2 and 5. He felt sure that it could be adopted without a vote.

74. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.69 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.78

75. Mr. MOEVI (Department of Public Information (DPI)) said he had noted the comments by two delegations concerning the apparent discrepancy between the resources devoted by DPI to information and the seemingly incongruous percentage of resources made available to the Centre for Human Rights. He had informed the Department at Headquarters, of the Commission's concern, but had not yet received a reply.

76. Information activities in the field of human rights had always constituted a large part of DPI's programme of work. Throughout the world, some 30 per cent of DPI's activities was devoted to human rights while, at Geneva, the figure was 70 per cent. The figure of 30 per cent corresponded to $US 12 million, which should not be regarded as having been set aside solely for the World Public Information Campaign on Human Rights, but for a vast range of publicity activities.

77. Although he did not know whether DPI would be able to provide the Commission with an exact breakdown of resources for information activities in general and those set aside for the World Public Information Campaign in particular, human rights naturally remained a major priority in the Department's programme of work. In view of the many tasks involving human rights that DPI had to confront, the figure of $US 12 million devoted to human rights, though 30 per cent of its total resources, was rather modest.

78. Mr. BENEDETTI (Italy), introducing the draft resolution (E/CN.4/1990/L.78) on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Bangladesh, said that the debate on agenda item 11 had highlighted the broad support for developing public information activities in the field of human rights, activities that were of crucial importance in the implementation of international human rights instruments and the improvement of the human rights situation throughout the world.

79. There had been a widespread feeling among the sponsors of the draft resolution that the information provided by DPI on the utilization of the considerable budget at its disposal for human rights information activities, both for 1989 and for the subsequent period, had been singularly lacking in detail. It was to be hoped that the next report would satisfy the legitimate desire of delegations to be fully informed on the allocation of resources in such an essential sector of the human rights programme.

80. He was grateful to Mr. Moevi of the Department of Public Information for his remarks, but regretted not having received orally the additional elements on the DPI budget that his delegation had requested when it had taken the floor two days previously.

81. A number of delegations had also stressed the need for a continuing evaluation process in order to make a further assessment of the impact of the World Campaign activities.

82. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

83. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.78 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.79

84. Mr. BENEDETTI (Italy), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Madagascar, said that the importance attributed to national institutions in the field of human rights had stemmed from the awareness that those bodies played a fundamental role in promoting and protecting human rights. He drew attention to the salient points of the draft resolution which, he hoped, could be adopted without a vote.

85. Miss ATTAH (Nigeria) said that her delegation wished to join the draft resolution's sponsors.

86. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.79 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.81

87. Mr. RÖNQUIST (Sweden), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Honduras, Morocco, Philippines, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom, said that 10 years had been spent on drafting the Convention on the Rights of the Child, whose adoption in 1989 had represented a milestone in the Commission's standard-setting activities. The Commission must continue to promote the Convention and the universal implementation of the rights of the child, and it was therefore important that the question of the status of the Convention should remain on the Commission's agenda for its forty-seventh session.

88. His delegation felt sure that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

89. Mr. HLOPHE (Swaziland) said that his delegation wished to join the draft resolution's sponsors.

90. Draft resolution E/CN.4/1990/L.81 was adopted without a vote

91. Mr. JOHNSON (United States), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had joined the consensus when the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly had adopted the Convention on the Rights of the Child, his delegation having taken an active part in the drafting of that instrument. His Government was currently considering the possibility of signing and ratifying that Convention.

92. His delegation was not opposed to a separate agenda item on the status of the Convention at the Commission's forty-seventh session. Certain issues had, however, become politicized in the past, and his Government presumed that the sponsors were committed to preventing that from happening again in the future.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.